

BRIEF

TO THE

HAMILTON - BURLINGTON - WENTWORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW

ON BEHALF OF



COUNTY OF WENTWORTH

TOWN OF STONEY CREEK
TOWN OF DUNDAS
TOWNSHIP OF SALTFLEET
TOWNSHIP OF ANCASTER
TOWNSHIP OF WEST FLAMBOROUGH

TOWNSHIP OF EAST FLAMBOROUGH
TOWNSHIP OF BINBROOK
TOWNSHIP OF BEVERLY
TOWNSHIP OF GLANFORD
VILLAGE OF WATERDOWN

VOLUME 2



Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by
J. STEFAN DUPRE

BRIEF

TO THE

HAMILTON - BURLINGTON - WENTWORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW

ON BEHALF OF



COUNTY OF WENTWORTH

TOWN OF STONEY CREEK
TOWN OF DUNDAS
TOWNSHIP OF SALTFLEET
TOWNSHIP OF ANCASTER
TOWNSHIP OF WEST FLAMBOROUGH

TOWNSHIP OF EAST FLAMBOROUGH
TOWNSHIP OF BINBROOK
TOWNSHIP OF BEVERLY
TOWNSHIP OF GLANFORD
VILLAGE OF WATERDOWN

VOLUME 2



(1)

I N D E X

P A R T I I

INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE
PROPOSED METROPOLITAN WENTWORTH REGION

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Description of the Proposed Internal Structure for the Proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region	1
2. Justification of the Internal Structure on the Basis of The Smith Committee's Criteria and the Additional Criteria Prescribed by the "Guidelines for Regional Government" Presented to the Legislature of Ontario on December 2, 1968	5
(1) General	5
(2) Introduction	6
(3) Population Base	6
(4) Assessment Base	9
(5) The Cities and Boroughs	14
(6) The City of Hamilton	17
(7) The Borough of Ancaster-Dundas	19
(8) The Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby	22
(9) The Rural Boroughs	26
3. Comments on Forms of Regional Governments in Canada, United States and United Kingdom	28
(1) General	28
(2) Metropolitan Toronto	29



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115485013>

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
(3) Ottawa - Carleton	31
(4) Niagara Region Local Government Review	34
(5) Peel - Halton Local Government Review	37
(6) Regional Municipality of Peel - Halton	38
(7) Lakehead Local Government Review Proposals	41
(8) Other Areas	43
4. Designation of and Powers of the Metropolitan Structure and The Internal Structures	54
(1) Designation of Powers	54
(2) Two-Tier System	64
5. Affect on the Fiscal Status of the Formation of the Metropolitan Wentworth Region	67
6. Reasons for the Recommendation of a Two-Tier Structure of Government <u>for The Metropolitan Wentworth Region</u>	73
(1) The Argument Against a Single-Tier Government for the Metropolitan Wentworth Region	73
(2) The Argument Against a Simple Fed- eration of the Existing Municipalities	84
(3) The Argument for a Two-Tier Metro- politan Government for the Proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region	86
7. Summary of Submissions	100

PART II

INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF THE
PROPOSED METROPOLITAN WENTWORTH REGION

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED INTERNAL
STRUCTURE FOR THE PROPOSED METROPOL-
ITAN WENTWORTH REGION

General

1. (1) The proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region is to be comprised of 8 Local Units of Government, that is, 2 Cities and 6 Boroughs, - as set forth in Figure 56 and which Units of Local Government, we respectfully request, be designated and named as follows:
 - (a) Cities
 - (i) The City of Burlington, and
 - (ii) The City of Hamilton, and
 - (b) Boroughs:
 - (i) The Borough of Ancaster - Dundas, and
 - (ii) The Borough of Stoney Creek - Grimsby, and
 - (iii) The Borough of Glanford, and
 - (iv) The Borough of Beverly - West Flamborough, and
 - (v) The Borough of Binbrook - Caistor, and
 - (vi) The Borough of East Flamborough - Nelson.

The City of Burlington

(2) The proposed City of Burlington

- (a) is comprised of the southern urbanizing part of the Town of Burlington which generally lies within the urban service limit as set out in Figure 20 of our Brief, and
- (b) includes a small portion of the Township of West Flamborough which has frontage on Highway No. 6.

The City of Hamilton

(3) The City of Hamilton is comprised of the present City of Hamilton without any change in its boundaries.

The Borough of Ancaster - Dundas

(4) The Borough of Ancaster - Dundas is comprised of

- (a) all of the Town of Dundas, and
- (b) that part of the Township of West Flamborough lying
 - (i) to the south of the Escarpment between Highway No. 6 and the Town of Dundas, and
 - (ii) to the south of the Canadian National Railway between the Town of Dundas and the westerly boundary of the Township of West Flamborough, and
- (c) that part of the Township of Ancaster lying generally north and east of the intersection of Highways No. 2 and 53.

The Borough of Stoney Creek - Grimsby

(5) The Borough of Stoney Creek - Grimsby is comprised of

- (a) the Town of Stoney Creek, and
- (b) the Town of Grimsby, and
- (c) the Township of Saltfleet, and
- (d) the Township of North Grimsby, and
- (e) part of the Township of Binbrook.

The Borough of Glanford

(6) The Borough of Glanford is comprised of

- (a) the Township of Glanford, and
- (b) that part of the Township of Ancaster lying generally south and west of the intersection of Highways No. 2 and 53.

The Borough of Beverly - West Flamborough

(7) The Borough of Beverly - West Flamborough is comprised of

- (a) the Township of Beverly, and
- (b) the northerly part of the Township of West Flamborough.

The Borough of Binbrook - Caistor

(8) The Borough of Binbrook - Caistor is comprised of

- (a) the Township of South Grimsby, and
- (b) the Township of Caistor, and
- (c) the largest portion of the Township of Binbrook.

The Borough of East Flamborough - Nelson

(9) The Borough of East Flamborough - Nelson is comprised of

- (a) the Village of Waterdown, and
- (b) the Township of East Flamborough, and
- (c) the northern part of the Town of Burlington.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE
ON THE BASIS OF THE SMITH COMMITTEE'S
CRITERIA AND THE ADDITIONAL CRITERIA
PRESCRIBED BY THE "GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL
GOVERNMENT" PRESENTED TO THE LEGISLATURE
OF ONTARIO ON DECEMBER 2, 1968

General

2. (1) In delineating the boundaries of the new Local Municipalities - the Cities and Boroughs, we have among other things,
 - (a) made every effort to conform with the criteria prescribed in the Report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation,¹ and in this respect:
 - (i) to increase the population and strengthen the assessment base of certain Municipalities in order to create more viable Local Government Units, and
 - (ii) to distinguish between urban and urbanizing Municipalities and those which are and should remain rural for the foreseeable future,
 - (A) by including within the urban and urbanizing Municipalities the area which is generally defined by the Urban Service Limit, as shown in Figures 19 and 20, and

¹ Report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation:
Vol. II, Chapter 23, paragraph 60, p. 515

(B) by including in the outer ring those areas which will not be within the urban service area within the foreseeable future and which as a result, are not expected to be urbanized in the foreseeable future, and

(b) to create Local Municipalities or Local Government Units with a "Community Identity" in respect of "sociological", "historical" and "geographic" characteristics.

(2) In the remainder of this section we will examine the following characteristics of the proposed Cities and Boroughs of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region,

- (a) the population base, and
- (b) the assessment base, and
- (c) the fiscal status, and
- (d) certain characteristics of each of the Cities and Boroughs.

Population Base - Internal Structure

(3) In Metropolitan Wentworth a significant increase in the population of individual Municipalities as described in Figure 56 has been achieved, so that the large differences which presently exist between fragmented urbanizing and small rural Municipalities have been reduced as shown in Table 4.4. In the urban and urbanizing Municipalities comprised of

- (a) the Town of Burlington, and
- (b) the City of Hamilton, and
- (c) the Town of Dundas, and
- (d) the Town of Stoney Creek, and
- (e) the Town of Grimsby, and
- (f) the Village of Waterdown, and
- (g) the Township of Saltfleet, and
- (h) the Township of Ancaster,

the population ranges now from a low of 2,007 persons in the Village of Waterdown to 288,993 persons in the City of Hamilton; a difference of 286,986 persons as shown in Table 21.1. Six of these Municipalities, accounting for 14% of the total population, have a total population of less than 20,000 persons. Although the City of Hamilton with 62.0% of the total 1967 population still has a much higher population than any of the other Municipalities and in this respect comprises more than 50% of Metropolitan Wentworth's population, significant increases in the population base of other Municipalities have been attained and at the same time the range in population has been considerably reduced. In Metropolitan Wentworth the smallest of the urban and urbanizing Municipalities, the Borough of Ancaster-Dundas, would have a population of 28,537 persons,

which is a significant increase over the present situation. It should also be noted that only one Municipality, the Borough of Binbrook-Caistor, will have a population of 7,679 which is a little less than the 8,000 persons - the minimum recommended by The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.¹ In the present predominantly rural Municipalities lacking water and sewer services the population ranges from a low of 1,840 persons in the Township of Caistor to a high of 8,125 persons in the Township of West Flamborough or a difference of 6,285 persons. Eight Municipalities accounting for 8.7% of the population of Metropolitan Wentworth fall into this category. In Metropolitan Wentworth this difference is reduced to 4,907 persons in the rural Municipalities. The smallest rural Municipality, the Borough of Binbrook-Caistor, has a population of 7,679 persons as compared to 1,840 persons in the Township of Caistor which is the smallest Municipality under the present arrangement. Table 21.2 shows that the varying rates of growth of the urbanized, urbanizing, and generally rural areas, will result in a gradually changing balance between them. The dominating position of the City of Hamilton (currently about 64% of the population) will continue but, we submit, will be reduced

¹ Statement by the Honourable W. Darcy McKeough, Minister of Municipal Affairs, made in the Legislature of Ontario on December 2, 1968.

to 50%, the total population of the proposed Region, in 20 to 25 years. The urbanizing City of Burlington and the Boroughs of Ancaster-Dundas and Stoney Creek-Grimsby will increase from 30% to 40% of the total population in the same period. The substantially rural Municipalities are expected to gain very little population for about 15 to 20 years, after which they will begin to take on the role of the urbanizing Municipalities as shown in Table 21.2 and Figure 57. Although variations in population still exist among the new Municipalities these differences are offset by distinguishing between the larger urban and urbanizing Municipalities and those which are and should remain rural for the foreseeable future, thereby, more closely relating total population to the demand for governmental services and to "access".

Assessment Base -
Internal Structure

- (4) In recommending the internal boundaries or structure as set out in Figure 56,
 - (a) a significant increase in the assessment base of individual Municipalities particularly in the presently fragmented urbanizing and rural Municipalities has been achieved. In the existing Municipalities comprising the Metropolitan Wentworth Region 10 Municipalities representing 10.9%

of the total population, are operating on an assessment base of less than \$46,000,000 with one Municipality as low as \$10,799,000 - for example the Township of Caistor as shown in Table 6.7. In Metropolitan Wentworth the Borough of Binbrook-Caistor will have the lowest assessment base (\$49,517,000) as shown in Table 21.1.

The City of Hamilton would continue, under the revised Internal Structure, to have 65.6% of the total assessment base of all the Municipalities, and

- (b) the City of Hamilton in the proportion of commercial-industrial assessment and per capita assessment would continue to be ahead of all other Municipalities, but the percentage of commercial-industrial assessment among the other Municipalities would be substantially increased as shown in Table 21.1. In the present Municipalities the proportion of commercial-industrial assessment is between 5.9% for the Township of Caistor and 29.3% for the Township of Saltfleet. The proportion of commercial-industrial assessment would be between 11.3% for the proposed Borough of Glanford and 22.8% for the proposed Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby among the new Municipalities but excluding the City of Hamilton.

Although there would still be considerable variation in the proportion of commercial-industrial assessment in the predominantly rural Municipalities, there would be a smaller range of variation in the new urbanizing Municipalities (excluding the City of Hamilton) than in the existing Municipalities of strong urban growth. The ratios now vary from 9.3% in the Township of Ancaster to 29.3% in the Township of Saltfleet, compared with 17.8% in the proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas to 22.8% in the proposed Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby in the future, and

- (c) it should be pointed out that the assessment ratios, as shown in Table 21.1, indicate that under the new structure only one Municipality, The City of Hamilton, has a "balanced" assessment which is generally accepted as consisting of 60% in the residential category and 40% in an industrial-commercial category. While there can be no real quarrel with the "60-40" assessment "rule of thumb" its applicability in any one Municipality is open to question. The pursuit of the "balanced" assessment ratio by any one Municipality can, and does, create unnecessary Municipal competition for industry with serious affects on the realization

of the best uses of land. The attempt to overcome these inequities in the assessment ratios of Local Municipalities and to allow better utilization of land on an area-wide basis is one of the prime motives in reorganizing the structure of local government. When the total assessment is spread across the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region, the ratio between residential and industrial-commercial approaches the "balanced" (60-40) formula and because Metropolitan Wentworth will assume responsibility for major area-wide services it will no longer be as drastic if the City of Burlington or the Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby has a greater percentage of residential development as long as the "60-40" ratio is maintained for the Region as a whole, and

- (d) the total spread in assessments per capita among the Municipalities would be reduced from \$2,377 to \$2,102 by the consolidation of Municipalities that have occurred. Moreover, 96% of the population would live in Municipalities with average assessments per capita of \$6,286 to \$7,710 whereas now 89% live in Municipalities with average assessments per capita of \$6,178 to \$7,710. While there would be at least as much variation as now among the new rural Municipalities, the differences in per capita assessment would be reduced among the urbanizing

Municipalities from \$1,880 to \$759. Although some equalization is achieved by consolidating or combining certain existing Municipalities to form more viable units and to create a more balanced assessment base (commercial-industrial to farm-residential ratio) it must be recognized variations in the assessment base still exist. However, full equalization in the base among the new local Municipalities is not absolutely necessary or essential since further equalization of the assessment base will be accomplished by having the Metropolitan Municipality carry the responsibility for certain area-wide services and to pay for certain of these area-wide services by an equal levy on the total assessment base, and pay for others, that is, major components of water supply, sewerage treatment systems and police services, etc., by an equal levy on the area benefited or the urban service area as has been discussed in this Brief.

The Cities and Boroughs of
Metropolitan Wentworth

(5) The City of Burlington

(a) Community Identity - The proposed City of Burlington has a well defined community identity which is associated with modern suburban forms of development including commercial facilities and an expanding "clean" industrial area. Although there are several neighbourhood centres such as Aldershot, Port Nelson area and the Appleby area, the Municipality is making an effort to focus its Community on the Brant Street - Guelph Line area where the Town Hall and Burlington Mall are located. It is our opinion that the Municipality, as proposed, will have a strong "Community Identity" as a component of this Region by extending its present suburban character and standards of development which are generally of good quality and design, and

(b) Sociological Characteristics - A percentage of the population living in the proposed City of Burlington are employed in the industrial-commercial and business fields within the proposed City of Burlington itself. However, the City of Hamilton and other areas within the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region attract a large majority of Burlington's labour force which does not work in

the proposed City of Burlington. The existing small minority of the population who are engaged in the agricultural industry within the proposed City of Burlington is expected to gradually disappear as urban development uses up the remaining agricultural land within the proposed City of Burlington, and

- (c) History - Historically, the proposed City of Burlington is associated, as previously indicated, with the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region in the early development of the "Head of the Lake Communities". It has grown from the original small town site close to the intersection of Brant Street and Lakeshore Road by its proximity to the Wentworth Region and by a series of annexations one of which involved Aldershot which was part of the Township of East Flamborough in the County of Wentworth, and
- (d) Geographic Characteristics - The proposed City of Burlington is characterized by irregular terrain in the vicinity of the Escarpment and along its boundary with the Borough of East Flamborough-Nelson and level lands to the north and along the lake which lands are suited for urban development purposes. The top of the Escarpment runs parallel

to Highway No. 5 in the Aldershot area, and then swings in a north-westerly direction out of the City area crossing Highway No. 5 some distance north of the present Wentworth County boundary, and

(e) Economic Base - At present the economic base of the proposed City of Burlington relies heavily upon assessment produced by high standard residential development. It does, however, have the potential of attracting industrial development, and a substantial area has been set aside for this purpose in the Official Plan, which in theory will permit it to attain the desirable 60% industrial-commercial to 40% residential assessment ratio. The planned industrial area has good road service, excellent exposure to the Queen Elizabeth Way, proximity to rail service, level stable and easily developable land. However, as noted in Section 6 of our Brief, it will be an extremely long time before this ratio is reached if the Town continues to expand as a residential community at rates equivalent to the past 15 years, and

(f) Balance of Interest Among the Citizens - The predominant interests of the people in the proposed City of Burlington would be those of suburban dwellers. There is an existing limited agriculturally oriented population in the area, however,

this is decreasing as the urban development extends, and already most of the land in the proposed City is priced to a level where it does not constitute economic farming land, and in our opinion, the proposed City of Burlington will continue to experience unusual and extreme urban pressures for the foreseeable future, and

(g) Relationship to Drainage Areas - The boundaries of the proposed City of Burlington have been established having regard to the economic limits of servicing as shown in Figures 19 and 20 and the future land use pattern as shown in Figure 17.

(6) The City of Hamilton

(a) Community Identity - The proposed City of Hamilton comprises the present City of Hamilton as shown on Figure 56. It is our conclusion and our submission that there are two distinct identities within the City of Hamilton, although both have common interests in the City as one unit. They are the City below the Escarpment to the Lake whose character is associated with the heavy steel industry and "city" residential living, and the "mountain area" consisting of large sub-divisions of single family dwellings with scattered apartment development and shopping centre developments. The area above the

Escarpmont relies heavily on the industries within the City of Hamilton for its job opportunities, and

- (b) Sociological Characteristics - The area within the proposed City of Hamilton is to a large extent urban in nature although it has very substantial areas requiring services and remaining for either development or urban renewal. The characteristics of the people who live in the proposed City of Hamilton are those associated with city dwellers and suburban dwellers. Their job opportunities exist in the heavy industries based in the City of Hamilton, together with other industries, and further job opportunities in the City associated with the commercial and business fields, and
- (c) History - The City of Hamilton was historically part of the County of Wentworth and obtained village status on February 13, 1833 and city status on January 1, 1846. It has had a steady growth for over one hundred years with a profound effect on the development of this Region and, particularly, with the growth of the steel industry in Canada as we previously discussed in Sections 3 and 6 of our Brief, and

(d) Economic Base - The economic base of the proposed City of Hamilton relies heavily on the surplus revenue producing assessment from industry, a major port facility, and to a lesser extent, on the surplus revenue producing assessment from commercial development. A large percentage of total assessment is provided by residential land uses, and in particular, single family dwellings. Although the City is and will be faced with extremely heavy Municipal costs - for example among other things redevelopment, road construction, sewer replacement, and a secondary sewage treatment plant it does enjoy a healthy economic base if one considers that the proportion of industrial-commercial assessment was 46.6 per cent in 1967. In our opinion the City is in a financial position to support not only its own Municipal needs but also to contribute substantially to the economic viability of the Region of which it forms the most important unit.

(7) The Borough of Ancaster-Dundas

(a) Community Identity - The proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas whose boundaries have previously been described and which are set out in Figure 57 consists of the Town of Dundas and parts of the Townships of West

Flamborough and Ancaster which lie within the urban service limit as shown in Figure 19 and in Figure 20. Within the proposed Borough boundaries are existing communities such as the Town of Dundas and the Village of Ancaster which are urban in character. Much of the area within the proposed Borough uses the existing commercial facilities in Dundas and in the Township of Ancaster. The future identify of each of the Communities created will be of an urban and suburban nature and, in our opinion, these community centres previously mentioned will continue to serve the neighbourhoods within the Borough as it develops but will retain their history, tradition and characteristics, and

(b) Geographic Characteristics - The proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas has within its boundaries many of the most attractive physical features in the Region including the Ancaster-Dundas Valley, sections of the Escarpment and Cootes' Paradise. Except for small areas in Ancaster which are relatively flat, the remainder of the proposed Borough is undulating with wooded areas and many creeks and steams all of which contribute towards the creation of an attractive environment for

residential forms of development, yet at the same time, presenting physical problems with respect to servicing urban development, and

- (c) Sociological Characteristics - The majority of the people within the proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas are urban dwellers who work within the proposed Region. There is a limited population that is engaged directly in agricultural pursuits, and
- (d) History - Both Ancaster and Dundas have long historical associations with the early development and settlement of this proposed Region. The Websters Falls area in West Flamborough was also settled at a very early date and the products of the early agricultural and lumber industry in the area were handled through Dundas, which prior to the development of the railway system was a more important Lake Port than the City of Hamilton. The Desjardins Canal was built to improve Dundas' access to the lake. The Village of Ancaster was an important settlement at the time when the Region was known as the "Head of the Lakes" and was first settled, and
- (e) Balance of Interest Amongst the Citizens - It is our opinion that the majority of the citizens who now live in the proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas

have interests associated with a modern suburban environment. There are areas in West Flamborough where peoples' interests lie with the rural environment, however, as the Borough becomes urbanized these interests will change to those of the balance of the Borough's, and

(f) Relationship to Drainage Areas - The boundaries of the proposed Borough of Ancaster-Dundas were established by taking into account the natural drainage pattern and Land Use patterns (existing and future) so that the said Borough will have within its boundaries those lands which can be supplied with full urban services in this section of the Region.

(8) The Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby

(a) Community Identity - The Borough of Stoney-Creek-Grimsby has several well defined communities within its boundaries, that is, Stoney Creek, Fruitland and Winona in the County of Wentworth and the Town of Grimsby in the West Lincoln Area. Future Official Plans for the Township of Saltfleet (through a policy decision of Saltfleet Council) are proposed to contain a significant subregional centre in the vicinity of Highway No. 8, between Fruitland Road and Jones Road, which could provide this Borough, together with other existing centres such as the Town of Grimsby,

with a community centre within the proposed Region. Urban development of a residential character in the Town of Grimsby and the Township of North Grimsby already has occurred on the "Lake Plain" below the Escarpment. The character of the Borough will be suburban in nature. At present there are significant areas of land south of the Escarpment which are rural in character. Recently the Department of Economics of the Province of Ontario under the H.O.M.E. Program, has projected a community above the Escarpment west of Highway No. 20 and abutting the City of Hamilton which could accommodate from 60,000 to 70,000 persons and which will provide a major stimulus to development in this Borough. The Borough brings together four Municipalities which together have common interests in the development of water supply and sewerage disposal systems and therefore will allow for area-wide planning development and administration of these facilities, and

(b) Economic Base - The Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby includes the Towns of Stoney Creek and Grimsby, the Townships of Saltfleet and North Grimsby and part of the Township of Binbrook. The Borough would have had a population of 40,128 persons in 1967 representing 8.6 per cent of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth's population. Estimates of future

growth in this Borough place the 1990 population at 113,529 persons representing 11.4 per cent of the total population of Metropolitan Wentworth. It is our submission, on the basis of advice, that based on the said estimated projection of population the proposed Borough, the third largest municipality in terms of population in Metropolitan Wentworth, will be one of the most rapidly growing municipalities, and

(c) relationship to Drainage and Servicing Areas -
In our opinion the formation of the Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby makes one municipality responsible for the servicing and administration of an urbanizing area which at present comes under the jurisdiction of four separate municipalities. This recommended reorganization would reduce the probability of future problems of intra-municipal co-operation that might occur if the boundary were located where it would cut across existing and proposed servicing patterns. More specifically the following factors support the formation of the proposed Borough,

(i) the Towns of Grimsby and Stoney Creek and the Townships of North Grimsby and Saltfleet face similar problems in the growth of their respective communities in that urban growth

is, and will for the foreseeable future be confined as shown in Figures 17 and 20 to the area between Lake Ontario and Niagara Escarpment which forms a major barrier to service extensions (water and sewerage systems) and also adversely affects the accessibility of the area south of the Escarpment, and

- (ii) the Ontario Water Resources Commission has recommended that a major sewerage disposal and collection system be developed to serve the Town of Grimsby, the Township of North Grimsby and a major portion of the Township of Saltfleet as shown in Figure 20. The development of this scheme will require area-wide planning and co-ordination which only can be ensured by uniting the four municipalities to form a single administrative and planning unit, and
- (iii) the existing water supply system as shown in Figure 19 which serves the Town of Grimsby, the Township of North Grimsby and a part of the Township of Saltfleet emphasizes the close interrelationships which already exist in this area of Metropolitan Wentworth and which we

respectfully submit supports our case that these Municipalities can develop more naturally as a single unit than on a fragmented basis.

(9) The Rural Boroughs - There are four predominantly rural municipalities, that is, the Boroughs of East Flamborough-Nelson, Beverly-West Flamborough, Binbrook-Caistor and Glanford adjoining the urban and urbanizing Municipalities which generally comprise that part of Metropolitan Wentworth within the urban service area as shown on Figures 19 and 20. The predominantly rural Municipalities, with the exception of small areas comprising a small proportion of the total population, do not have and are not expected to have extensive utility systems within the foreseeable future and consequently can be expected to retain their rural character, and in respect of

(a) Community Identity - The four predominantly rural - Boroughs of East Flamborough - Nelson, Beverly-West Flamborough, Binbrook-Caistor and Glanford generally comprise a number of Village or Hamlet Centres which serve to give the rural community a certain sense of identity. Some of these village centres are listed together with the 1956 and 1961 population in Table 2.1 according to the existing Municipalities. The community identity of these Boroughs is as can be expected deep rooted in their

tradition of rural life and farming background, and

(b) Sociological Characteristics - The interests of the people in these predominantly rural Boroughs of East Flamborough-Nelson, Beverly-West Flamborough, Binbrook-Caistor and Glanford are generally with the agricultural industry. The growing number of people living in scattered residential development have chosen a rural environment over an urban environment although their job opportunities in some cases will be in other parts of the proposed Region, and

(c) Intermunicipal Boundaries - Because the boundaries between these four rural Boroughs of East Flamborough-Nelson, Beverly-West Flamborough, Binbrook-Caistor and Glanford have been established at locations where they pass through low density rural development and because of the absence of urban services (water and sewer systems) in these Municipalities, the possibility of future problems of inter-municipal co-operation, both between a rural Borough and the adjoining urban or urbanizing Municipality and among the rural Boroughs themselves, is minimized.

COMMENTS ON FORMS OF REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS IN
CANADA, UNITED STATES AND UNITED KINGDOM

General

3. (1) There are two basic forms of Local Governmental organization in Canada. One form of Local Government organization is based on the sovereign municipality with administrative and legislative powers in a certain area such as cities and separated towns and the other is the federated (County) or more recently the metropolitan (Metropolitan Toronto) form of local government in which the administrative and legislative powers are allocated to each of the two levels of government. It must be noted that within each of these basic forms of local government fundamental differences can and do exist. We propose to outline briefly the basic characteristics of the structure of regional government in certain urban regions in Canada as well as in certain areas of the United States and the United Kingdom. It will be noted that the structure of existing or proposed governmental structures, with the exception of that which was proposed by Plunkett in the Peel-Halton Local Government Review Area, involve a federated system of government. In each of the areas examined the existing regional units - Metropolitan Toronto, Ottawa-Carleton and Metropolitan Winnipeg - has been structured on the basis of detailed studies of the particular area and hence reflect,

- (a) the distribution of the population within the region, and
- (b) the size of the region, and
- (c) the geographical characteristics of the region, and
- (d) the servicing characteristics of the region, and
- (e) the present political structure in the region, and
- (f) the extent of the community identity which exists in the region, and
- (g) the fiscal resources which reflect the viability of the region as well as the lower-tier municipalities.

Metropolitan Toronto

- (2) The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto was created in 1953, being a federation of thirteen Municipalities in the Toronto area which retained their separate identities but had certain of their powers either shared by or transferred to the Metropolitan council or second tier of government. This form of Government in Metropolitan Toronto was based upon a decision of Dr. L. R. Cumming in 1953 which stated in part as follows:

"In the opinion of the board no system of local government organization which is based upon rigid territorial divisions of municipal jurisdiction and an equally rigid partition of physical and fiscal assets can be expected to provide for an area such as this the essential local

services which must be the responsibility of municipal government. In an ordinary municipality the homes of the residents, the offices, shops and factories where they are employed and the commercial establishments serving them are all contained within a single taxing unit. Taxes from industrial and commercial properties are available to the same municipality which must provide essential services for the resident population. But in a metropolitan area modern methods of transportation, both public and private, together with a lack of space in the central city and a desire for better living conditions have resulted in a distribution of population completely unrelated to the distribution of the non-residential assessment which is essential to keep the cost of providing municipal services within reasonable limits."

"In addition to the serious implications of the present division of municipally profitable taxable resources, including the undesirable prospect of a continued segregation of "have" and "have not" municipalities in the metropolitan area, the existing territorial limits of municipal jurisdiction are responsible for the failure of the municipalities as a group to provide urgently needed new capital projects and services required to maintain the growth and prosperity of the whole area. The provision of a better system of arterial highways and adequate public transportation, the planning and construction of a co-ordinated system of water supply and sewage and drainage disposal, the construction for many years to come of schools and other public buildings in strategic locations and the provision of parks and recreational areas for a great new population, are all problems which, in the board's opinion, cannot be solved unless some centralization of authority and jurisdiction is obtained. In the judgement of the Board these problems cannot be solved by further reliance upon the process of voluntary inter-municipal co-operation with its apparently inevitable delays."

In 1957, following the studies of a Commission chaired by Dr. Cumming, the powers of the Metropolitan Council were extended to include police and licensing. After a Royal Commission Investigation and report on Metro Toronto were completed by Commissioner H. Carl Goldenberg in 1965, the principal recommendations of the Commissioner were enacted into law by the Government of Ontario which included, among other things, a continuation of the two-tier federated system of Government but with a further consolidation of certain of the Local Municipalities. Total amalgamation which was urged by the City of Toronto was rejected by Commissioner Goldenberg and by the Government of Ontario. Effective on January 1st, 1967, therefore Bill 81, among other things, reduced the number of Municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto from 13 to 6 (being the City of Toronto and five boroughs) and enlarged the powers of the Metropolitan Council. We are of the opinion that the legislation in respect of Metropolitan Toronto structure is not only recognized as a model for the world but should be pursued as a model in establishing our governmental two-tier structure for the Metropolitan Wentworth Region.

Ottawa-Carleton

(3) The legislation to create the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton which was effective January 1, 1969 and

is the first legislation enacted as a result of a Local Government Review. There are substantial differences between the recommendations of the Commissioner, Murray V. Jones, and the provisions of the Ottawa-Carleton Legislation. However, we believe that it would be beneficial to discuss the merits and applicability of the Ottawa-Carleton legislation in respect of our proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region. The structure of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton is essentially a federation of the existing 16 municipalities comprising 2 cities, 3 villages and 10 townships, within the geographical limits of Carleton County and one township in Prescott County. There are no alterations in the internal boundaries of the Local Municipalities. We do not favour or recommend this form of a federated regional municipality without internal boundary changes for the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region because,

- (a) we are of the opinion that the number of local municipalities should where necessary be reduced in order to create stronger and more viable local Municipalities which is in accord with The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs' "Guidelines for Regional Government" as presented to the Legislature of Ontario on December 2, 1968, and

(b) we are of the opinion that consolidation of the predominantly rural municipalities in our proposed Region will enable the resulting units to serve the people more effectively and to enable them to have a more effective voice on the Regional or Metropolitan Council by reason of their increased viability as Local Governmental Units, and inter-municipal co-operation either between the rural Municipalities or between a rural and an urban Municipality should also be facilitated because of the reduction in the number of Municipalities in our proposed Region from 16 to 8.

Niagara Region Local Government Review
Proposals and the Government of Ontario
Proposals for the Said Review Area

(4) The Mayo Commission in 1966 after studying the structure of Local Governments in the Niagara Peninsula recommended that the Counties of Lincoln and Welland be reorganized into twelve municipalities, that is, 4 Cities and 8 Boroughs within the Municipality of Metropolitan Niagara. Although the Commissioners' report, which was released in August, 1966, has not been implemented, The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, in an Address¹ indicated his agreement with the general principles of local government reorganization in the Counties of Lincoln and Welland as proposed by Mr. Mayo. Both the Commission and The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs recommended a union of the two Counties to form a single Regional Unit which is to be designated "The Regional Municipality of Lincoln and Welland" subject to a possible alteration of the Boundaries in the West Lincoln Area on a determination being made in respect of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region. The structure of The Regional Municipality

¹ Address by The Honourable W. Darcy McKeough; Minister, Department of Municipal Affairs "The Regional Municipality of Lincoln and Welland"; Town of Niagara; January 23, 1969.

of Lincoln and Welland is essentially a federation of municipalities. Although the lower tier Municipalities in this federated system were based on the pattern of existing Municipalities, there were some significant changes in the boundaries of existing municipalities in which an attempt was made to create urban-centred local municipalities. In some cases the reorganization involved the simple combination of two or more municipalities to form one lower tier municipality. In other cases it was recommended that a new boundary be established in order to create a functional relationship with adjoining lower tier municipalities and to ensure and at the same time reduce the need for inter-municipal co-operation.

The Government of Ontario's recommended pattern of Local Governments in The Regional Municipality of Lincoln and Welland is set out in Figure 51. We respectfully submit

- (a) in respect of the recommended regional boundary that the westerly orientation of the West Lincoln Area as discussed in Section 12 herein is evidence of the sense of community which exists in Metropolitan Wentworth, and therefore supports the alteration in the westerly boundary of The Regional Municipality of Lincoln and Welland to exclude the West Lincoln Area as shown in Figure 52, and
- (b) in respect of the internal structure that the recommended two-tier structure is appropriate in the

Counties of Lincoln and Welland and that such a system can apply equally as well in the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region, and

- (c) that the combination of direct and indirect election to the regional government, as recommended by both the Commission and the Government of Ontario, is an experimental measure, and, we believe it does not provide adequately for a decision-making process which directly involves the lower tier governmental units.

Peel-Halton Local Government Review
Proposals and the Ontario Government's
Proposals for this Review Area

(5) The Plunkett Commission recommended two-county system of government for the Peel-Halton area and which was opposed by most of the municipal councils in the area. The division of the area into a northerly rural county and a southerly urban county was the major recommendation by Commissioner Plunkett as indicated in Figure 30. Plunkett also recommended a Two-County system of Government which would result in the abandonment of all Local Government Units through consolidation. We reject both the urban and rural County principle and the abandonment of the existing Local Government Units within our proposed Region because

- (a) such changes are too great a departure from the traditional system of local self-government, and
- (b) the single units ("counties") which are proposed are too extensive in area, as indicated in Figure 30, in our opinion, to comply, among other things, with the criterion of "access", and
- (c) the rural-urban division does not conform with the policy established by the Government of Ontario in its referred to "Guidelines" for urban-centred regions, and such a division, we suggest, would be unacceptable in the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth

Region which, we respectfully submit, must be seen as a whole region, as discussed in Section 6 of our Brief,

the recommendation involving the Urban and Rural Counties principle is contrary to the Smith Committee's recommendation, as shown in Figure 53, for regional government and which was affirmed by the White Committee, and which we report in Section 15 of our Brief, and to the recent policy statements by the Prime Minister of Ontario and The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, which we discussed in Section 8. Plunkett's recommendation for this division between the rural and urban parts of two Counties has been rejected, we are advised, by the Government of Ontario. We respectfully submit that we cannot accept the recommendation of the Plunkett Report in respect of the establishment of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region.

The Regional Municipality of Peel-Halton

(6) On January 22, 1969 The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs announced the proposed formation of the Regional Municipality of Peel-Halton¹ to comprise:

- (a) the County of Peel, and
- (b) part of the County of Halton, and
- (c) part of the County of Dufferin,

¹ The Honourable W. Darcy McKeough, A Tentative Proposal for Regional Government in Peel-Halton; An Address; January 22, 1969.

to be included within a single Regional Government. In establishing the westerly boundary of The Regional Municipality of Peel-Halton, The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated, in effect, he was placing the Town of Burlington in the proposed Peel-Halton Region although, we understood, a final proposal in respect of the Town of Burlington will await "the findings of the Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review Commission."¹ The Honourable Minister recommended further that the new Region would be comprised of a federation of Local Municipalities as shown in Figure 31. The Local Municipalities are to be consolidated and new and more functional boundaries created in order to establish stronger and more viable Local Municipalities, and we respectfully submit that the proposed Regional Municipality of Peel-Halton Area should not include the Town of Burlington for the reasons set out in Sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 of our Brief. We respectfully contend that the proposed Regional Structure for the Peel-Halton Area, excluding the Town of Burlington, is appropriate for the following reasons,

- (a) the proposed Region would establish one strong region between Metropolitan Toronto and Metropolitan Wentworth, and
- (b) the formation of a lower tier of local governments is necessary in this large region in order to retain the vital element of accessibility, and

¹ Ibid, p.6.

(c) the distribution of the population among a number of existing urban centres also supports the formation of a lower tier of urban centred communities comprising areas one to six inclusive, as recommended by The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs,¹ and we respectfully submit further that the principles of consolidation and boundary alterations to create more viable units of Local Government have been applied in the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region.

¹

Ibid, pp. 8, 9 and 10

Lakehead Local Government Review Proposals

(7) The special problems created by two adjacent cities of almost equal size in population were tackled by Commissioner Hardy in his Report and Recommendations dated March 11th, 1968. Mr. Hardy recommended the consolidation of Port Arthur, Fort William, two adjacent Townships and part of another Township into a single "Lakehead City" which would form a part of the District Municipality of Thunder Bay.¹ Much of the proposed 'Lakehead City' will be open rural or forested area which is unlikely to be developed in the foreseeable future, as indicated by the growth projections in the Report, however, it was considered desirable by Mr. Hardy that the development of the present urban area be properly planned and serviced by a single lower-tier government comprising the Cities of Port Arthur and Fort William because of the circumstances peculiar to this Area at the Lakehead, such as,

(a) the District Municipality for the present District of Thunder Bay would comprise a very extensive area, the northerly limit of which is about 200 miles north of Port Arthur. Mr. Hardy assigned certain functions to the new

¹

Eric Hardy, Special Commissioner; Report and Recommendations Lakehead Local Government Review; March 11, 1968
p. 95 and 98

District Municipality which reflect the problems and needs of this vast area. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has announced that legislation will be introduced at this Session of the Legislature to amalgamate in effect the 2 cities into the "Lakehead Cities". We are of the opinion, and we accordingly respectfully submit, that the particular circumstances of geography, the development pattern, the population size and the lack of other urban areas close to the Lakehead are not common to our proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region. We respectfully suggest, therefore, that to apply Hardy's recommended governmental changes in respect of the formation of a single Lakehead City to our Study Area would violate all of the prescribed criteria for Regional Governments. We cannot accept or recommend total amalgamation of the urban areas within our proposed Region which would, among other things, not only erase all local government boundaries and destroy our communities, their traditions, history and characteristics, but which would destroy in effect our rural areas in that they would become not only immersed in a sea of urban costs but placed in a very weak position on an urban-dominated council.

(8) We respectfully state, for the assistance of your Commission, that this reform movement in Government Structure is taking place not only in Ontario but in other Provinces of Canada, the United States, England, Ireland and areas of Europe and Asia. We do not wish to take the time of your Commission in dealing with the movements occurring outside the Province of Ontario that you may consider inappropriate but, for your assistance in coming to a conclusion, we believe we have an obligation to place before your Commission some indication of what we have found is occurring, in that such information is, we suggest, essential in not only reviewing the problems of the Study Area but the remedies for such problems.

(a) in the Province of Nova Scotia

three Study Reports are now being considered by the Government in respect of the municipal structures in Sydney, Halifax and Pictou County, and

(b) in the Province of New Brunswick -

the Government is considering a Study Report in respect of the City of Fredericton and has already passed legislation that has effected very far reaching reforms of the legislation applicable to Municipal structures and much of which, we are advised, was enacted without obtaining the views of the citizens or the elected officials at Municipal levels, and

(c) in the Province of Quebec -

- (i) the Government is considering The Blier Report in respect of the Island of Montreal, and
- (ii) considering The Sylvester Report in respect of the Isle of Jesus, and
- (iii) awaiting the La Haye Report dealing with the Montreal Metropolitan Area, and

(d) in the Province of Manitoba -

- (i) as a result of the Report and recommendations of the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission in 1959, the enactment in 1960 of The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act created the second two-tier Metropolitan Government in Canada. This Act federated 14 municipal governments under a Metropolitan Corporation. The members of the Council, contrary to Ottawa and Toronto, do not represent Municipalities but are directly elected by Constituencies that cut across the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg and the suburban Municipalities. As a matter of interest Dr. L.R. Cumming chaired a Review Commission that inquired into the Metropolitan Corporate set-up of Winnipeg and in his Report of 1964, among other things, Dr. Cumming confirmed the principle of two-tier Government, and

(ii) there is presently being considered the 1964 Revolutionary Report of the Mitchener Royal Commission which recommended, among other things, the establishment of 11 regional centres in the Province of Manitoba with each such centre to be the place where

(A) the Province would establish a Regional Office to co-ordinate its departmental activities and to meet the Municipalities, and

(B) the Municipalities of the Area would maintain a Regional Council for the Area,

we reject this concept as, in our opinion, it promotes the centralization of power in the Provincial Government, and

(e) in the Province of British Columbia -

The Municipal Act has been amended to encourage the formation of District Councils to enable Municipalities to join together to resolve their growth problems. This legislation is viewed as being an experiment and is considered likely to be successful under the particular circumstances in British Columbia. We believe such legislative approval could possibly have worked in this Province if steps had been taken some time ago to effect such reforms, and

(f) in the United States -

the matter of reform of Local Governments including the principle of "federation and its application to Local Government Units" was discussed for many years in generalized terms and few serious attempts were made to formulate specific plans and obtain their adoption. The first proposal emanated from a 3 member Commission appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts to study forms of governmental organization for the Boston Metropolitan Area. In 1896 the Commission recommended the enactment of a Bill by the State Legislature but the Bill failed to pass. Subsequently in the 1920's attempts were made in Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, Chicago, New York and Los Angeles, among others, but in most cases the attempts were defeated by the State Legislatures or for other reasons such as the public referendums. No further serious attempt was made to meet the problem until

(i) in 1955 a Plan of Federation was recommended for Miami and in 1957 Legislation was passed by the State Legislature creating the Metropolitan Corporation of Miami which federated Dade County and the City of Miami as a

Metropolitan Government and which is regarded as being a "model" U.S. Metropolitan form of Government - at least it is the only scheme that has been implemented, and

(ii) in 1959 the Congress of the United States established "The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations" for the following stated purpose:

"Because the complexity of modern life intensifies the need for the fullest co-operation and co-ordination of activities between the levels of government, and because population growth and scientific developments portend an increasingly complex society in future years, it is essential that an appropriate agency be established to give continuing attention to inter-governmental problems."

and,

(A) This Commission in its August 1966 Report resulting from a comprehensive Survey of Municipal Structures recommends in effect the establishment of "Metropolitan Governments" or Two-Tier Governments as the needed co-ordinating mechanism for Local Governments in metro-areas to meet the population growth problem, and

(B) This Commission in its April 1968 Report confirms the need of a co-ordinating mechanism with area-wide powers to deal with problems arising out of urban growth and in addition recommends the enlargement of the powers of local governments which it calls "the unshackling of local governments" - letting them do for themselves, in effect, and

(iii) in 1967 there was established by the California Legislature "The Joint Committee on Bay Area Regional Organization" to study the two-tier possibilities of a regional organization in the San Francisco Bay Area in order to assure the effective and orderly planning, growth and development of that Metropolitan Area together with the conservation of its physical and environmental resources. The enabling legislation states:

"There is as yet no governmental body or bodies capable of permanently and effectively dealing on regional problems facing San Francisco Bay Area, and there is a need to co-ordinate the steps being taken by cities, counties, and districts of the San Francisco Bay Area to avoid duplication of effort and make possible understanding of regional problems, and to make better use of the region's resources and potential"

The region under consideration in this study is composed of 9 Counties including San Francisco - an area of 7,000 square miles and 4.5 million people - with a projected population of 8 million by the year 2000 and by the year 2020, 14 million, and

The Scope is stated to be as follows:

- (A) "The Joint Committee is investigating the following multi-county, multi-jurisdictional concerns in order to evaluate the need, desirability, and feasibility of incorporating any or all of them into some form of regional organization", and
- (B) "— the creation of a statutory agency with limited powers to perform and co-ordinate functions of a regional nature", and
- (C) "— regional planning", and
- (D) "— air and water pollution", and
- (E) "— solid waste disposal", and
- (F) "— regional parks and open space", and
- (G) "— transportation, including airports, bridges, rapid transit, and ports", and
- (H) "— the socio-economic impact and desirability of regional government", and
- (I) "— the necessary powers required for a regional government to function effectively", and

- (J) "---membership composition and selection methods for said regional government", and
- (K) "---methods for including existing regional and sub-regional multi-county districts and agencies where appropriate, into said new regional government", and
- (L) "---the determination of an appropriate definition for 'the San Francisco Bay Area' with respect to regional organization", and
- (M) "---all other functional matters relevant to regional organization", we are advised that this Committee has filed its Preliminary Report but that it is not available for distribution. In any event we trust this outline indicates not only that this matter is a problem in the United States but indicates the enormity of the undertaking in order to do now in the reform of Governmental structures what should have been done fifty or sixty years ago, and

(g) in England, Ireland, many countries of Europe and parts of Asia, we encounter the same developments as in Canada and the United States. We do not propose to cover such developments in detail, however, we think we should draw the attention of your Commission to the fact

(i) that there is evolving in England a very strong movement for reform of local government structures. It is reported as follows in the British Government Publication "Local Government in Britain"

"In contrast to this, the basic structure of local government remained virtually unchanged with the result that, in some areas - and especially in those with a high concentration of industry and population - local councils were no longer able to deal effectively enough with the many and complex problems with which they were concerned. Because of this, local government in Greater London has already been reorganized; elsewhere in England and in Scotland its structure in relation to its existing functions is under review by two Royal Commissions; while in Wales proposals for a new local government pattern have been proposed."

The genesis of reform is found in the 1958 Local Government Act which provides for the organization of local government throughout England to be reviewed by a Local Government Commission. However, in the case of Greater London a Royal Commission was constituted in 1957 under the Chairmanship of Sir Edwin Herbert. As a result of that Report and the passage of the London Government Act of 1963 the Greater London Area is now governed by a true two-tier Metro Government in that all local governments are operating under an intergrated Metropolitan Council together

with 32 Local Government Units instead of 117,
and

(h) that within the past month legislation was introduced in Northern Ireland to, as they state, "Reshape Local Governments." This legislation states in part:

"The present local government system stems from the nineteenth century and while it met the needs of the country well for several generations and has been served by devoted people, it is now, by common consent, in need of overhaul. Any comment made in this Paper is not to be taken as a reflection on the people who operate that system but rather on a system which is outliving its usefulness. The fact that an outworn system is being made to function is in itself a tribute to the people in local government to-day."

thus, from what we have outlined, we believe we have indicated that the movement for reform in Local Government Structures is not confined to the Province of Ontario but is a "World Wide Movement" and we think agreement is inevitable that such reforms are necessary for numerous and various reasons and, in most cases and areas that we have canvassed, we are satisfied that the causes, needs and remedies have a common denominator - the need for a Two-Tier System of Government with adequate powers to serve the interest of our growing and complex societies.

As has been stated by Robert C. Wood in "Metropolis Against Itself":

"Bigness and relatedness are two characteristics of a metropolitan area. They are in particular the trademarks of a modern regional economic system. As the central urban core divests itself of manufacturing and commercial functions, the geographical scope of economic activity steadily expands. Larger and larger portions of the labour force take up residence in the suburban hinterlands. In the new garb of shopping centers, commercial establishments follow the housewife and in search of space, manufacturing plants settle on the outskirts of the urban fringe. Only new recognition of the new responsibilities of local government will go to the heart of the difficulty----. This is the basic issue which metropolitan growth poses for metropolitan government to-day."

DESIGNATION OF AND POWERS OF
THE METROPOLITAN STRUCTURE
AND THE INTERNAL STRUCTURES

4. (1) We respectfully submit

- (a) that the existing form of Local Governments in the Area or Region bounded as described in Figures 2 and 3, be restructured by the application of the principle of "federation" to the Local Governments involved in the Region, and
- (b) that the Area or Region as described in Figures 2 and 3 be known as The Metropolitan Wentworth Region, and
- (c) that the principle of "federation" be implemented by continuing in principle the Two-Tier System of Government so that the said Region,
 - (i) will continue to be governed by a "Central Authority" with enlarged and in some cases exclusive functions or powers in respect of, in particular, major services that are regional in character and necessary to the proposed Region as described in Figures 2 and 3, and
 - (ii) will continue to be governed by Local Units or Governments that will have revised boundaries as described in Figure 56, but that will continue to perform, as in the past, those

functions and powers that are part of the truly local services which have come to be personal to the citizen, and which should not be assigned to any Central Authority, and

- (d) that the name of the Central Authority be "The Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth", and
- (e) that there be 8 instead of 16 Local Governments or Units and which may be described as follows:
 - (i) the City of Hamilton, and
 - (ii) the City of Burlington, and
 - (iii) the Borough of Ancaster-Dundas, and
 - (iv) the Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby, and
 - (v) the Borough of Flamborough-Nelson, and
 - (vi) the Borough of Beverly-Flamborough, and
 - (vii) the Borough of Glanford, and
 - (viii) the Borough of Binbrook-Caistor, andthe boundaries of such Local Governments or Units are set forth in Figure 56, and
- (f) that the powers of "The Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth" be exercised by a Council consisting of 29 Members plus a Chairman with the Members of that Council being appointed by and from the Local Government Units and the Chairman being chosen by the Metropolitan Council from their number which

representation is to be on an equitable basis so that no one Local Government or Unit can dominate the Region. Therefore, we respectfully submit that no Local Government should have representation on the Metropolitan Council in excess of 45% of the total representation. Further no Local Government should have less than one representative. We respectfully submit that the representation on the Council of The Metropolitan Corporation to be as follows:

	<u>Approximate 1967 Population from Table 21.1</u>	<u>Metro Representatives</u>
Metropolitan Wentworth	466,120	29 chairman
City of Hamilton	288,993	14
City of Burlington	68,713	6
Borough of Glanford	9,057	1
Borough of Beverly-Flamborough	12,686	1
Borough of Binbrook-Caistor	7,679	1
Borough of Ancaster-Dundas	28,537	2
Borough of Flamborough-Nelson	10,527	1
Borough of Stoney Creek-Grimsby	39,928	4

(Above representation to be subject to 45% qualification and to the minimum representation qualification)

- (g) that there be an Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Council of "The Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth" and which Committee, we suggest,
 - (i) be composed of 4, 6 or 8 Members with not more than 45% to be Members of the Council of the City of Hamilton and the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council to be the Chairman of the Executive Committee and to be entitled to vote, and
 - (ii) have in general the powers of a Board of Control, and
- (h) that the major powers of The Council of "The Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth" be among others, as follows:
 - (i) Assessment of all real property both metropolitan and local throughout the Metropolitan Area and that the Metropolitan levy on the local units for its own requirements be based on such assessment and that such levy in each case be not more than the proportion that the assessment of each such unit bears to the assessment of the whole area, and
 - (ii) Debenture Borrowing - borrowing of money, subject to the approval of the Municipal Board,

for the Metropolitan Corporation, Local Boards, Local Municipalities by issuing debentures on the credit of the Metropolitan Corporation, and

- (iii) Water Supply - construction and maintenance of all works for the production, treatment and storage of water and all trunk mains; the wholesale distribution of water to the area municipalities with power to fix wholesale rates and to set standards for local distribution systems in the area municipalities, and
- (iv) Sewage Disposal - construction and maintenance of trunk sewer mains and sewage treatment works to provide a metropolitan sewage disposal system and to set standards for local works connected to a metropolitan work, and
- (v) Roads - establishment of a metropolitan road system and designation of highways as metropolitan roads, with power to prescribe speed limits thereon and to control traffic over and to limit access to such roads, and
- (vi) Public Transportation - construction, maintenance and operation of all forms of public transportation within the metropolitan area, except taxis, and

- (vii) Education - co-ordination of educational facilities in the area by the Metropolitan Wentworth School Board in particular the responsibility of reviewing and co-ordinating all Divisional Board's activities, and
- (viii) Parks and Recreation - establishment of metropolitan parks and recreation areas, assumption of existing parks and recreation facilities and co-ordinating local parks and recreation programmes, and
- (ix) Health and Welfare - that is provision of homes for the aged, hospitalization and burial of indigents, maintenance of neglected children, part sanatorium care of tuberculosis and welfare assistance, and
- (x) Air Pollution - control, and
- (xi) Housing and Redevelopment - all of the powers and rights of a municipality, and
- (xii) Civil Defence - all of the powers and rights of a municipality, and
- (xiii) Licensing of Trades and Businesses, and
- (xiv) Traffic Control Systems - in Metropolitan Area including traffic regulations, and
- (xv) Administration of Justice - to the extent not assumed by the Province, and

- (xvi) Waste Disposal - regulation of power to establish facilities anywhere in Area, and
- (xvii) Ambulance - regulation and control of ambulance services, and
- (xviii) Metropolitan Planning - including that The Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth be the designated Municipality within the meaning of The Planning Act, and
- (xix) Conservation, and
 - (i) that the major powers of the Local Governments or Area Municipalities be (among others) as follows:
 - (i) Fire Protection, and
 - (ii) Water Supply - construction and maintenance of local distribution systems and retail sale of water to consumers, and
 - (iii) Garbage Collection, and
 - (iv) Sewage Disposal - local sewage collection and the construction and maintenance of local sewage systems, and
 - (v) Roads - construction and maintenance of local streets and sidewalks including sidewalks on metropolitan roads, and
 - (vi) Planning - planning by Local Planning Boards established as subsidiary planning areas under The Planning Act in conformity with, and in conjunction with, among other things, the

Metropolitan Official Plan, and

(vii) Housing - all of the powers of a Municipality, and

(viii) Hydro Electric Power - local distribution, and

(ix) Licensing and Inspection - all powers other than those transferred to Metropolitan Council, such as preparation and enforcement of building By-laws and Zoning By-laws etc. - marriage licenses, dog licenses, and

(x) Parks and Recreation - development of programmes for parks and recreation, and

(xi) Traffic Controls - regulation of traffic on local streets, municipal parking lots, etc., and

(xii) Taxation - levying and collection of taxes for local purposes including the Metropolitan levy, and

(j) that the education structure for the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region be as follows,

(i) the Divisional Boards as currently established, with effect from January 1, 1969, under The Secondary Schools and Board of Education Act, that is

(A) the Board of Education of the City of Hamilton, and

(B) the Wentworth County Board of Education
be continued, and workability of such a
system, but

(ii) that "The Wentworth County Board of Education"
be the Divisional Board for all of the Region
as shown in Figures 2 and 3 except the City
of Hamilton, and

(iii) that there be established a Metropolitan
Board of Education to consist of representatives
of the Divisional Boards for the purpose of
co-ordinating the standards, etc. of the said
Divisional Boards, and

(k) in respect of Health

(i) that the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region
described in Figures 2 and 3 be deemed a
"Health Unit" under The Public Health Act, and

(ii) that in respect of that "Health Unit" a Board
of Health be established and be known as "The
Metropolitan Wentworth Board of Health", and

(iii) that "The Metropolitan Wentworth Board of
Health" be composed of

(A) at least 6 Members of the Metropolitan
Council, and

(B) not more than 3 persons appointed by the
Lieutenant-Governor on the recommendation

of the Minister of Health, and

- (l) that a Library Board be established and be called "The Metropolitan Wentworth Library Board" to co-ordinate and regulate the library facilities, including finances, in the Metropolitan Area, and
- (m) that a Transit Board be established and be called "The Metropolitan Wentworth Transit Board" to consolidate, co-ordinate and regulate all forms of public transportation in the Metropolitan Area, and
- (n) that a Police Commission be established to co-ordinate, regulate and control all Police Forces in the Metropolitan Wentworth Region and that such Board be called "The Board of Police Commissioners for Metropolitan Wentworth", and
- (o) that the terms of the Members of the Council of the Metropolitan Corporation of Wentworth and of the Local Councils be not less than three years, and
- (p) that the composition of the Councils of the proposed Cities and Boroughs be determined on the following basis,
 - (i) a Mayor, and
 - (ii) an Executive Committee consisting of 4 members of the Council and the Mayor, and

- (iii) not less than 4 Aldermen if elected by general vote, or
- (iv) if elected by Wards and there are not less than 4 Wards then one, two or three Aldermen for each Ward or if less than 4 Wards then 2 or 3 Aldermen for each Ward, but each Council should be empowered to pass By-laws prescribing the composition of the Council in accordance with the terms prescribed.

(2) The proposed allocation of powers between the Metropolitan Councils and the Local Councils is based, in effect, on the concept of a Two-Tier System of Government as described in Section 6 of this Part II. We believe it is appropriate to quote from "The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment" edited by Coleman Woodbury - pages 27, 28 and 29 - as follows:

"The social climate has undergone a revolution in the last century and a half. At times the changes have verged on chaos and it is little wonder that our cities have reflected this indecision. During this period men's ancient roots in the soil have been uprooted. At a time when more families than ever before were seeking something they sensed the large city alone could give, an almost equal number fled the city for the suburbs. But as men rushed into the arms of the all-devouring city there arose in the 1880's a persistent and successful drive to preserve the wilderness, to create national parks, to reserve for public use many of the natural wonders of our nation, and on a more

modest metropolitan scale, to build forest preserves and continuous park systems along streams and hills. Taken together, these movements suggest that men were seeking a renewal of that balanced life which was snatched away by the industrialization of our society.

Perhaps because we placed so high a value on the machine we have been prone to forget the family in favor of the economic man. If in our system of values we were to elevate man rather than money or machines to a position of dominance our whole concept of the city would undergo a revolutionary change. A balanced life would become the goal combining manual and intellectual, rural and urban pursuits, communion with nature, and contact with the metropolitan world of art and music. Surely this points to the necessity of dealing with these problems on a regional basis

The concept of the region implies a balance between cultivated farmland, the city and unravaged nature. Each offers its unique contribution to man, each complements the other, and through such variety man's whole existence is enriched. The region thus conceived can become the healthy basis for our future plans whereas the continued conflict between the city and the country life robs each. The very existence of the words "urban" and "rural" point out the grievous losses that man suffers from overspecialization of function in each area. No matter where he chooses to live he has lost something which the city dweller attempts to recapture artificially by summers in the country or the farmer by weekends in the city.

It is the metamorphosis of the present metropolis into the balanced region to which I look forward. This new metropolitan region will embrace many towns and counties, will cross state lines, and will bear only a faint resemblance to the conurbations of yesterday. A principal ingredient of each new region will be a galaxy of new towns. A second is the full-fledged redevelopment of the old city with congestion eliminated and light and life let into the old stagnating areas.

New towns as the keystones of a region are the best hope we have of creating a better environment capable of constant renewal and improvement. They are economically and technically possible today."

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its Tenth Annual Report of January 31, 1969 on page 10 stated as follows:

"So, at the beginning of 1969, the Nation continues its search for a New Federalism-dedicated to balance; designed to correct structural, functional, and fiscal weaknesses; and rooted in a vital partnership of strong localities, strong States, and a strong National Government. Federalism, after all, seeks to enhance national unity while sustaining social and political diversity. The partnership approach is the only viable formula for applying this constitutional doctrine to late Twentieth Century America. Yet, this approach can succeed only if all of the partners are powerful, resourceful, and responsive to the needs of the people. The alternative is a further pulverizing of State and local power, and the consequent strengthening of the forces of centralization."

We believe, therefore, that we have devised Governmental Structures for the proposed Region whereby the elements of diversity and insularity will coexist with the thrusts towards a coalescing economic system and the promotion of an already existing distinct regional culture.

AFFECT ON THE FISCAL STATUS OF THE
FORMATION OF THE METROPOLITAN WENTWORTH
REGION

5. The affect of the formation of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region on the fiscal status of the Region was reviewed in Section 6 of our Brief. For the assistance of the Commission and of the Government of Ontario we will attempt to assign the total local and regional expenditures to the proposed Cities and Boroughs of Metropolitan Wentworth. This is relatively easy in the Municipalities where there are only minor changes in the Municipal boundaries - for example in the case of the Boroughs of Stoney Creek-Grimsby and Binbrook-Caistor but it is more difficult for other proposed Municipalities. Table 21.4 gives an estimated comparison of the "before and after" affects of the proposed consolidation of the present Municipalities into larger Local Units and the allocation of certain responsibilities to the Regional or Metropolitan Municipality, which was dealt with to some extent in Section 6 of our Brief. In general, Table 21.4 indicates the direction of change in rates but such cannot be considered accurate in the absolute amounts. In comparing the rates in the present Municipalities with those in the proposed Municipalities

(a) it should first be noted that these estimates are

based on an analysis of 1966 expenditures and, therefore, do not account for changes in the pattern of expenditures or grants from senior governments since 1966, and

- (b) it should be noted that the major changes between the rates in the existing and proposed Municipalities are in the Education rate, with the rural Municipalities paying considerably higher amounts. This change, however, is not a result of the proposed Metropolitan system, but of the consolidation of the school system into County Boards, which has already taken place on January 1st of this year. In the proposed system, the City of Hamilton's education rate would go up somewhat, the rate in the rural areas will go up considerably, and that in most of the other urban or urbanizing areas will go down, and
- (c) although a detailed breakdown in the general Municipal rates is not given, a major reason for increased rates in this area is the increased health and welfare costs with all the Municipalities except the City of Hamilton paying higher rates. This greater sharing of health and welfare costs on a regional basis is understandable, since it appears that the central Cities must generally bear the Region's welfare burden as indigents are forced

into the City by, firstly, the search for jobs, and secondly, the lack of welfare services in the smaller Municipalities. In general, rural areas will also pay somewhat more for police services if such are required or should be provided and, in a few cases, slightly more for regional recreation and community services, and

(d) on the overall, including Education and General Municipal rates, it is expected that the City of Hamilton will pay slightly more as its industrial-commercial tax base is shared over the larger area. The other urban and urbanizing areas will be generally favoured with lower rates due to the broader tax base. The rural areas will be favoured by the broader tax base, but this will be outweighed by their obtaining regional services, such as protection, and sharing to a greater extent services such as education, health and welfare and regional parks, and

in spite of the rural areas perhaps receiving better services in some areas and sharing to a greater degree services that are properly regional, there is still the need to recognize the different levels of need or service as between urbanizing and rural areas and assigning the costs to the areas receiving the benefits. In our opinion

the best method of doing this is through the autonomy of local units established on a basis of the distinction, as proposed, between urban and rural needs. We need to recognize the different levels of service as between urbanizing and rural areas and the need for "equity" in assigning the costs to the areas of benefit or that requires the benefit. This was one of the reasons for our proposing a two-tier system and separating for local purposes an inner ring of urbanizing Municipalities from an outer ring of Municipalities which are rural and which will most likely remain predominantly rural for at least 25 - 30 years. Table 21.5 summarizes the differing levels of local services for the new Municipalities which are estimated in Table 21.4. We respectfully submit that this difference would be and must be accentuated by a thorough analysis of current Public Works expenditures and by effective means established by legislation applicable to the proposed Metropolitan Government so as to effectively assign the costs of major water, sewer, and urban arterial roads and other similar services over only the urban and urbanizing ring of Municipalities. We respectfully submit and emphasize that only through legislation can the political and fiscal autonomy of Local Units be secured and the residents assured of deciding and paying for their desired level of local services, - diversification

in services has been one of the attributes or privileges of our Region as well as of our Democracy. - It is our submission that this attribute must be preserved by effective legislation, and although the urbanizing municipalities will be developing considerably over the next 30 years, some parts will remain rural for a long time. In these cases, the rural areas should be distinguished from the urban service areas and exemption maintained from service rates for such as sewer and water facilities. Small urban service areas should also be designated in the outer ring of municipalities around the few small urban centres. It should also be noted, in the analysis contained in this section, that no attempt was made to allocate the expenditures in respect of Regional utility systems (water supply and sanitary sewerage) to the benefiting area. The use of an urban service area in allocating certain regional expenditures among the local municipalities would exempt the rural municipalities and rural areas of the urban and urbanizing municipalities from service rates for services such as water and sewer facilities. Although the use of urban service areas, should be recognized as only a subsidiary and second-best solution to the problem of distinguishing between the service needs of rural and urban residents it is an indispensable technique which can be used to more closely relate service rates to the benefits received and, therefore, it is our opinion and our respectful submission that

this technique should be used in addition to all other equitable formulae that can be devised by the Metropolitan or Regional Authority to establish equitable tax rates for Metropolitan Services, that will not only not destroy the character of our proposed Region but the agriculture and farming industry of our proposed Region.

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF
A TWO-TIER STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT
FOR THE METROPOLITAN WENTWORTH
REGION

The Argument Against a Single-Tier
Government for the Metropolitan
Wentworth Region

6. (1) According to the Report of the Smith Committee¹

"it is an appropriate blending of the two objectives (access and service) that should determine size".

The Committee also states at page 507

"that in most areas of the Province, the twin objectives of service and access can be realized in optimal balance through a full fledged Regional Level of Government and a streamlined lower-tier level."

It is respectfully submitted that a single-tier form of Government is undesirable and not justified for the following reasons, among others,

- (a) the Policy of the Government of Ontario as prescribed in the "Guidelines for Regional Government" joins to and supports the Regional Government on a two-tier basis, and
- (b) the significant legislation to date in Ontario, that of Metropolitan Toronto and that of the Ottawa-Carleton Region, has been on a two-tier basis. Although the present Ottawa-Carleton system and the original Metropolitan Toronto

¹ op. cit., chapter 23, at p. 507.

system were based on a mere federation of the existing Municipalities, the later Metropolitan Toronto re-organization implemented on January 1, 1967 stressed the need for internal consolidation to ensure more viable and workable units, and

- (c) a single-tier Government represents a complete abandonment of all the traditional forms and patterns of local Governments in the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region, which, despite the fact that there are recognized deficiencies in this century-old two-tier system, should not be simply wiped out and replaced with a single municipality of some 629 square miles containing more than 450,000 (1967) people as proposed by the City of Hamilton. That is to say - it abandons the traditional two-tier system of Government - the County at the upper level and the local Municipalities at the lower level to which the people of Ontario have been accustomed since the Baldwin Act of 1849, and
- (d) it represents a complete abandonment of the principle of "Federation" which permeates the political tradition of Canada. Government,

whether Federal-Provincial or Provincial-Municipal has worked best, it is submitted, by a division of powers and close co-operation between levels. The Provinces and the Federal Government are currently involved in constitutional reform and a redistribution of the powers they exercise in line with the changed economic and political structure of the Country. Similarly, the Province and the Municipalities are involved in a redistribution of powers and responsibilities, and the consequent redrawing of boundaries to conform to more workable units in view of the vast economic, social and governmental changes of the twentieth century. It is submitted that the proposal of a one-tier government set-up for the Metropolitan Wentworth Region would parallel a request by the Dominion Government for the abolition of Provinces or, a demand by the Province to take over completely all of the functions of local Government and which has been indicated as a trend in the February 1969 Report of The Ontario Economic Council entitled "Government Reform in Ontario". Neither position would be tolerated and it would, we submit, create bureaucratic, inefficient

Governments which would quickly lose touch with the desires of the people . In a growing Region such as the one proposed for the Metropolitan Wentworth Region, the same disadvantages and shortcomings of size would soon be obvious. Any one-tier Government with such a large area to govern and such diversified services to supply might, with the appropriate personnel, become an efficient organ, however, on the basis of the studies and current practice in most urban areas, as shown in Section 3 of Part II, and on the basis of our historical traditions, it is submitted that such would not likely be the case. The services of the modern state require diversification yet some overall conformity. Such a principle can be achieved most successfully, it is submitted, in the spirit of "co-operative Federalism". This applies, it is submitted, to the Regional-Local Government division of power and responsibilities as well. As de Tocqueville once wrote:

"A nation may establish a system of free Government, but without Municipal institutions it cannot have the spirit of liberty."

It is submitted that a Regional Government covering a large growing area with the host of powers and responsibilities that it would have in the modern welfare state would soon become as remote

as Ottawa or Queen's Park, and consequently the "spirit of liberty" or using the term of the Smith Committee, "access" would be lost.

Dr. L. R. Cumming, Q.C., in the well known hearing of the City of Toronto v. The County of York et al. in 1953 stated at pp. 44-45 of his report:

"The central question is whether the continued existence of local municipal governments, carrying out necessary and important functions of a local nature, is, after all, completely inconsistent with the concurrent existence of a senior metropolitan government equipped with adequate powers and resources to deal with area-wide problems. It is the opinion of the board that the most promising avenue of approach to a solution of this question is clearly indicated in the political history of our own nation, and that many of the fundamental principles so wisely applied in the federation of the British North American Provinces can be profitably adapted in the organization of a suitable form of local government in this area. The board cannot attempt any exposition of the political theory which found expression in the British North America Act of 1867, nor will it refer to the striking similarity between the position of the provinces prior to Confederation and that of the municipalities in the Toronto area eighty-five years later. It is sufficient to point out that in every true federation there is a recognition of the need for a dual system of government, an acceptance of the idea that the establishment of a strong central authority is the best method of dealing with vital problems affecting the entire area, and a conviction that the retention of local governments for local purposes is not only desirable but necessary." and,

(e) the test of successful government is not solely on the basis of "greater efficiency" in government

(i) as set out in Recommendation 11 (1.) of the City of Hamilton's Submission to the Steele Commission at p. 14. In this respect, the following statements made by Commissioner Murray V. Jones in his 1965 Report for the "Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton County Local Government Review" are appropriate:

"There are two basic patterns of municipal organization in Canada; the unitary 'sovereign' municipality which increases its size as urbanization spreads beyond its borders, and the 'federated' group of municipalities usually found in the county system of government or in some relatively new urban structures (Toronto and Winnipeg). The advantages of the single 'amalgamated' municipal government are to be found in central political control, uniform taxation, and an undivided administration; it can attain co-ordination of policies and administrative efficiency - but so can a dictatorship (theoretically). The test of healthy local government must be found in something far more than efficiency; democracy has never been efficient in the business management sense of the term. In local government the test must be both an ability of the governed to attach responsibility to the governors and for the governors (elected councils) to be responsive to the needs of the people." (p.24)

"The single, whole, centralized, "bureaucratic" large urban municipality is, therefore, not attractive as a preferable method of governing metropolitan areas; the new form of human settlement requires a more sophisticated approach." (p. 25), and

(ii) as indicated by Dr. L. R. Cumming, Q.C.,
who stated

"They are comparable with similar advantages in a completely centralized totalitarian form of National Government".¹

(f) it fails to provide for the continuation and fostering of a community of interest such as now exists, for example, in the City of Hamilton, Town of Burlington, Town of Dundas or in the rural areas of the recommended Wentworth Region. It is noted that objections from the Town Council of Burlington and from the Citizen's Association for an Independent Burlington stem in part from the feeling that there is a common interest, pride and concern amongst its residents for Burlington as a community. There is similar pride ~~in the cases of the residents of the City~~ of Hamilton and other Communities. If this "Community Spirit" which is stressed in certain

¹ City of Toronto v. The County of York, O.M.B. Report, p.32.

Briefs to the Commission is to be continued effectively and channelled in the interests of the whole of the Proposed Region, it is our opinion that this can best be accomplished by establishing a two-tier governmental structure for the proposed Region. The alternate of doing away with the Local Municipalities and substituting a single level of government within which Burlington, Dundas, Stoney Creek, Glanford and the remaining municipalities would become only historic names would not have the same importance to the residents as if they were political entities with prescribed jurisdictions, and

(g) the 62% of the population which the City of Hamilton comprises of the total in our proposed Region and the Recommendation of the City of Hamilton 11 (4.) which suggests that the City should have two-thirds of the members on a regional council (which is recommended for only a fixed period of time not to exceed five years and to be replaced by a one-tier government as set out in Recommendation 11 (1.)), provide conclusive evidence that the City of Hamilton would dominate the Region under a one-tier government or the City's suggested temporary

two-tier arrangement. We respectfully submit that domination by the City of Hamilton is unacceptable since it could not lead to a responsive government for the entire Region. In particular, the rural areas which occupy the majority of the Region now and will so continue for a long time, as shown in the projected Land Use Map which is Map No. 3 of the Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review Data Book and figure 17, cannot be expected to be represented adequately if representation is based solely on population. The four proposed predominantly rural Boroughs of Beverly-West Flamborough, Binbrook-Caistor, East Flamborough-Nelson and Glanford contain only 8.6% (39,916) persons of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth population but comprise 70% (454.54 square miles) of the total land area, and

- (h) if one recognizes the differences between urban and farm interests- the urban using the land intensively, the farmers making extensive use of land as their prime resource - it is obvious that a one-tier system cannot properly represent the two interests. If representation in proportion to population is accepted, the

farm voice becomes insignificant. With urban interests dominating, there would likely be little attention to preserving farm areas, and rural uses would probably be considered more in terms of recreation for the urban dwellers. Any other form of representation giving substantial weight to the farm interests would go against the "one man, one vote" principle of our democratic system. The best solution, it is submitted, is the autonomy of Local Government Units, as proposed in addition to the Metropolitan Regional Government looking after the Metropolitan Wentworth Regional needs, and

- (i) the advantage of greater participation in Government at all levels can best be achieved by a Two-Tier system. One of the prime elements of Democracy is participation by the Governed. It is clear that a Two-Tier system will provide greater opportunity for such participation and this consideration if greater participation overrides any arguments based on greater efficiency or cheaper costs of Governmental administration, as indicated, in effect, by Dr. Cumming.

Moreover, participation and experience of the local councilors will be invaluable for the participation at higher levels of government, and

(j) the talents and experience that will be lost if the present Local Government officials are replaced by a few Regional officials would be a great loss to the Region as a whole. If the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region were established on a Two-Tier basis, there seems little doubt that the objective of a strong, efficient Local Government structure would be attained - and "Democracy could be kept at Home".

Moreover

"____ citizens would take much more interest in local government if they knew they had an important job to do. Those who complain about the decline of interest in Municipal affairs often fail to observe that local authorities are not being left with tasks that can captivate the citizens' interest."¹

¹ Donald C. Rowat, Your Local Government.
McMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1955,
p.137-138.

The Argument Against a
Simple Federation of the
Existing Municipalities

(2) It might be suggested that the present range of Local Municipalities, - Townships, Villages, Towns and City - be maintained as the Local Units of Government, however,

(a) because of their extremely wide variation in size, from the Township of Caistor and Village of Waterdown with populations of 2,000 or less to the City of Hamilton with almost 300,000, this would not be practical. From a fiscal viewpoint, even for local services only, the tax bases of the small municipalities are so small that any major development would have a shock affect on the tax rate and could lead to even greater disparities. From the point of view of representation of the small municipalities in a Metropolitan Council, it would be necessary to have a huge inefficient and cumbersome Council in order to give them a single representative. While Local Autonomy for local services is strongly advocated, it must be recognized that a reasonable balance of representation can only come from a consolidation of the existing municipalities which are low in population, and

(b) Although Metropolitan Toronto was virtually a simple federation, their experience was that some type of combination became necessary shortly after it was implemented in 1953. The Goldenberg Commission was established in 1964 and its principle recommendation was that the 13 federated Municipalities be reduced to 6 (1 City and 5 Boroughs), and this was implemented in 1967. Based on this experience, it is submitted, that much time, effort and expense could be saved by the immediate establishment of integrated and viable local units, and

(c) the arguments advanced in Section 2 of this Part show the desirability of altering internal boundaries in order that there be a more definite division between urban and rural areas, and between urban and rural costs. The proposed division of the Township of Ancaster as shown in Figure 56, for example, places the urbanized portion of the Township within the new Borough of Ancaster-Dundas where the growth of an urban area can be planned and financed without affecting the rural area of Ancaster to the same extent as such urban growth would if the existing Township boundaries were to be maintained.

The Argument For a Two-Tier
Metropolitan Government for
the Proposed Metropolitan
Wentworth Region

(3) In summary,

(a) the converse to the arguments against a One-Tier Metropolitan Government or amalgamation as set out in Sub-Section (1) of this Section, and the alternative to the arguments against a simple federation of the existing Municipalities as set out in Sub-Section (2) of this Section, is a viable and workable Two-Tier Regional Government as proposed in Sections 4 and 5 of this Part. Thus, the results of the twentieth Century - the social and economic changes as they apply to the problem of Provincial-Municipal relations indicates the following incontrovertible facts;¹

"(1) there is a strong demand for better local services, especially with respect to roads, education, health and welfare; (2) more and more of these services are coming to have a wider-than-local aspect; (3) central administration is now quite possible and, through the benefits of specialization, often appears to be relatively more efficient; (4) municipalities are in a reasonably strong, but not expanding, financial position; and (5) increasing emphasis upon revenues requiring wider-than-local collection has placed the senior governments in a financial position superior to that of the municipalities."

¹ Rowat, op cit., pp. 122-23.

Fortunately, there is a solution to the problem of size which involves neither the abolition nor the simple Federation of existing Municipalities;¹

"And that is to create enlarged units, governed by locally appointed or elected Councils, to administer only those services that require large areas for efficient administration. With such a scheme it would not be necessary to uproot the existing municipal institutions. Instead, a second tier of regional governments would be created which would contain the existing local units. These governments would administer only municipal services of wider-than-local interest (such as health, welfare, institutional care, education, and secondary roads). But they could also administer provincial services capable of being provided by municipal authorities on a regional basis. Taxes to pay the local share of the cost of all these services would then be levied at a uniform rate over a whole region, thus equalizing the burden. This is the sort of concession local authorities must be prepared to make to the growing interdependence of modern society if the double objective of strengthening local government and providing more efficient services is to be achieved."

"The achievement of such a reorganization does not mean that the problem of centralization will be completely solved. If citizens are to ensure that this more efficient, but more remote and complex, organization of local government is responsive to their needs, they must keep a firm grip on the controls. They must determine generally what is to be done through influencing their elected representatives, and also how it is to be done

¹ IBid. pp. 136-139.

through advising their public officials. In order to do this they must engage in vigorous democratic discussion and make their views known. More and more we are coming to realize that it is not only the number of citizens actually sitting on Councils and other local bodies that is important, but also the number who are actively keeping track of what these bodies and their officials are doing."

and

(b) it is crucial that some form of Local Identity remain. As William A. Robson wrote in "The Governors and the Governed":¹

"'Progress for democracy,' Dr Erich Fromm writes, 'lies in enhancing the actual freedom, initiative, and spontaneity of the individual.' What matters, he says, is that the opportunity for genuine activity be restored to the individual; and that his own purposes and those of society shall coincide, not ideologically but in reality. We must replace the manipulation of men by active and intelligent co-operation.

Every thoughtful person will agree that there is a need to increase citizen participation at all levels of government."

and

(c) Dr. L. R. Cumming in his celebrated decision in 1953 in respect of Metropolitan Toronto put the case against amalgamations in these words,²

"On the whole, the board must agree with the main contention of the respondents that although the type of government proposed by the city might be strong, efficient and well organized it would not be a local government."

¹ At p. 55.

² op cit. pp. 31 ff. (emphasis added).

"It is not by any means the view of the board that the central authority should eventually take over all of the important functions now performed by the local councils and their local boards. The board is convinced that the local governments will always have a vital role in the general scheme of metropolitan government. This should not prevent the gradual and orderly transfer to the central authority of certain additional powers which may now be described as desirable but not immediately essential. With respect to these, it is the opinion of the board that their transfer should await the gradual development of public opinion after the new system has been placed in operation. The board wishes to emphasize at this point the fact that one of the great virtues of any federal scheme is its flexibility and the comparative ease with which it can be adapted to changed conditions and the realities of a particular situation."

and

- (d) maintenance of a primary level of governmental units within the proposed Region
 - (i) enables the residents of such local governmental units to maintain community ties and local interests which now exist,
and,
 - (ii) fosters the growth of pride in one's community at the local level at which it is usually considered much easier to identify than at the much broader regional level, and

(e) the protection of rural interests is more likely under a two-tier arrangement wherein certain of the new units will remain rural in character for a considerable period of time. With the general division between the rural areas and the urban or urbanizing areas, the rural ratepayers are given much more assurance that they will not be required to bear costs arising out of urban development, which costs the urban areas should be required to pay. Undoubtedly one of the most difficult problems of municipal administration is the allocation of costs in an equitable manner. It goes without saying that in any local governmental unit experiencing growth, and which contains extensive rural areas, it is extremely difficult to prevent rapidly increasing costs of urban services from having a very serious effect on the incomes of the rural population. We know of no guaranteed method of overcoming this problem, but we are of the view that a zealously administered use of the urban service area, such as exists in Oakville and Burlington, is a major step in the right direction. The combination of establishing

the urban service area and the delineation of costs to be allocated within and outside the area, combined with a thorough Official Plan and financial plan, should reduce the incidence of abnormal prices being paid for land outside the urban service area, which would then bring on the application of the relevant provisions of the Assessment Act. The concern, however, is not so much with this latter problem, since presumably the bona fide farmer is selling his land to someone who is a prospective developer (urban use) and consequently, if the assessment on the land and hence taxation are increased, the burden will not fall directly on the farm owners as such. Urban service areas should be recognized as only a second-best solution to the problem of distinguishing between the service needs of rural and urban residents of the Region, the best solution being the division of the municipalities between those likely to remain rural and those now urban or likely to urbanize in the future, and

- (f) individual differences amongst the primary tier municipalities are considered desirable as opposed

to over-standardization of development within the Region, and only in a two-tier arrangement will it be possible for each of the new municipalities to be able to offer different levels of service according to their councils' policies and in relation to the needs and financial capability of the municipality. In this way, there can be some measure of personal choice remaining for those people who desire, for example, to reside in areas with a standard of development or services that suit their own personal needs or desires, and

(g) the well-known Chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, William R. Allan, Q.C., stated:

(i) in 1964 in his Brief to the Goldenberg Commission in respect of Metropolitan Toronto,

"On the other hand, federation establishes a general metropolitan jurisdiction without completely merging the local governments involved. This form permits broad flexibility.

In line with the recommendations of this Conference, a Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle has been created, inspired in part by the success of the Toronto plan which was given close, on-the-site, study.

The City of Chicago shares the municipal

services field with the County Board for Cook County which includes representation for thirty townships in the metropolitan area beyond the city proper.

The City of Philadelphia is but part of the metropolitan area which extends to five adjoining urban counties and municipalities in New Jersey abutting on the other side of the Delaware River.

Federation for this area is recognized in the Delaware River Port Authority which builds and operates bridge crossings of the Delaware so vital for the people of this area and currently is embarking on a rapid transit project to link the banks for the people of this area, as the solution to a regional problem.

The amalgamationist viewpoint, as being preferential to Metro, is usually based on:

- (a) greater efficiency,
- (b) economy through reduced overhead,
- (c) equality of cost to all in the centralized unit.

To a great extent these bases are inter-related and interwoven. Each and all are ultimate goals in government and business. For one or all of those reasons, the services which are the responsibility of Metro have been combined. Any one or all together justify the centralization of regional services which are mandatory and basic; the bedrock of municipal services--less than which we cannot do without--such as police, water, sewage, "bottle-neck" breaking arterial roads, public transit and welfare for the destitute.

But it does not follow blindly and automatically, that greater efficiency and reduced cost will ensue the centralization of those services in respect of which local choice as to how much, where and when is guaranteed by provincial municipal law; nor can it be argued that citizens of any municipality of today should be forced to pay the cost, on an equalized basis, of services which they neither want nor desire on a scale or in a way provided by another municipality. These are the services which are the subject of local decision today and should not be removed by legislative action from that realm. These are the services which only the local municipality should determine for those whom it represents.

The contention that union means decreased cost, if valid, ought to lead to a proposition that there be but one province; Ontario, being the dominant one, should gobble up the rest of the provinces to save money.

On the other hand, unification will point to uniformity throughout the area, including uniformity in standards. It is inconceivable that any existing standard of municipal service would be decreased; therefore, the prevailing standard in each municipality would have to be, under amalgamation, brought up to the standard of the municipality where the most of the best is available, even if all people may not want sidewalks on both sides of streets, or semi-weekly collection of garbage from their rear door, nor may they prefer bookmobiles to imposing but immovable libraries of brick and stone. Standardization on this basis must result in greater overall cost, apart from loss of local choice or preference. Amalgamation -- regardless of increased efficiency -- will mean a larger area budget, if only due to equalizing the degree and type of service.

A metropolitan government does insure equality in levy for those essential and necessary regional municipal services while permitting the retention of local autonomy in choice for discretionary services. This is a highly preferable position to one where all the taxpayers of an area are forced to pay for services, presumably available if desired, but not obligatory. Amalgamation removes the right of local choice, but furthermore, forces payment for services whether wanted or not.

Amalgamation, or unification, of all services, regional and local, would be the means of removing municipal representatives from the citizenry to whom they are now far closer than representatives of either other level of government, being personally known as they are and also being the repository of local complaints. The existing system has worked well because the Metropolitan Council establishes policies for regional municipal services which tend to operate over large areas, but are approved and executed as a federation with all member municipalities having a voice through consultation and a voice in Council.

This brings into focus what I regard as the key to the success by decision and accomplishment of the present system. Each member of council has a dual loyalty and responsibility: local and regional. Knowledge of plans, proposals and projects by both councils has enabled metropolitan representatives to coordinate, complement and supplement the undertakings of each council.

I interject at this point another consideration at the root and substance of the accomplishments of the past ten years by this form of municipal government; namely, the dual loyalty and responsibility of its members. It is of basic importance that the members of a Metropolitan Council, anywhere, should be duly elected members

of their local Council. In our situation, this has created a liaison which results in knowledgeability of what is being planned and executed as area projects so that there is coordination and consistency with local planning and projects. This system has removed the possibility of that rivalry which is bound to be created by the existence of two municipal councils comprised of different people, where notwithstanding the demarcation of respective responsibilities and obligations, human nature will provide a running battle and competition for power, or for exoneration from blame for the tax bill submitted to the taxpayer. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance I place on a continuation of the present system whereby duly elected members to local councils are also automatically constituted members of the area council.

A number of leading pro-amalgamationists claim that taxes will be lower in the City of Toronto after amalgamation. I disagree, without hesitancy. Taxes will be higher for a considerable number of people in the city, if not all of them. There are two factors influencing and governing this situation. One has been dealt with previously; municipal government will cost more if amalgamated because centralization means uniformity in salaries and services by seeking the highest level existing in an area municipality.

My views and opinions are not based solely on statistics or maps. I have been very strongly influenced by personal observations of intense community interest, community pride which could not be evaluated in a business transaction, and closer than usual citizen participation in council decisions. This has developed because of groups of citizens in each of these communities who have been motivated by public service on their part so that there are assets in each of these municipalities which will not appear on the balance sheet of the municipal corporation. Any municipality would be so much the poorer were these intangibles to be lost or written off."

and

(ii) again, and this time more forcefully on November 12, 1968 in a speech to the Advertising and Sales Club of Toronto:

"Featured in Time, one week ago, "The Breakdown of a City -- New York" one reads of the rebellion of the masses - because municipal government is not structured for limitless masses. Municipal government is predicated on individual involvement to be contrasted with the unbridgeable gap in American metropolises between governed and governors.

The same social mess which has reared its ugly head in different ways in Chicago, Los Angeles and Detroit will be created in Metropolitan Toronto unless we heed the warning and learn by their experience.

Yet, our newspapers, ignorantly and blindly drive us down the same road to the same predictable results when Lindsay, Daley and other leaders of metropolitan areas would give their all to regain what we still have -- but which amalgamation would erase -- the opportunity for each and every citizen to be a part of his local municipality, not a name, street number and postal district in a mass of millions.

To be elected to head an amalgamated system, of course, would be an expensive proposition. Success, to some degree, would depend on the support of the news media -- perish the thought -- although this might rationalize their views. New York City Mayor John Lindsay invested \$2.5 million for his last campaign. His defeated Democratic opponent went for over \$1.5 million in campaign expenses.. Is this what you want?

Urbanization, which is closely related to the structure and growth of the economy and rising income levels, will continue to increase in Canada at a rate that is greater than that in the other major industrial countries.

Because Canada is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current world-wide struggle for economic, scientific and cultural leadership. The superiority of our economic system, our methods of Government, and our way of life will have to be demonstrated in the cities."

We respectfully submit, therefore, that the works and statements that we have referred to and quoted in this sub-section point to the most promising form of Government that will "Keep Democracy at Home" for the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region, that is the Two-Tier System - which has its roots in the political history of our Nation - The British North America Act which established, in effect, a Federal System for our Country. In every True Federation there is a need for a dual system of government and we accordingly submit, with respect, that our Federal System at the Municipal Level must be preserved. We must, with conviction, ensure that there is a strong Central or Regional Authority to deal with Regional needs and that the Local Governments are retained for local needs. Regional Governments should be viewed, not as a means to remove municipal government from the neighbourhood level, but as a means to bring the Province closer to the people, to coordinate provincial programs and to facilitate a closer relationship than is now possible between Provincial and Local Governments. Indeed the Regional

Government could become the normal and convenient meeting place of federal, provincial and Local Governments for negotiations on housing, urban renewal, economic development, roads, railways, civil aviation, and all other matters that will remain the concern of all three levels of Government. We respectfully submit that a "True Federation" at the Municipal level can effect improvements in the working of Canadian Federalism and the preservation of "Our Democratic Way of Life."

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

7. We respectfully submit

(a) the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region as described in Figures 2 and 3 not only complies with the criteria set forth in the "Guidelines for Regional Government" as proposed by The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on December 2, 1968 but a regional concept that implies a balance between cultivated farm land, the urban centres and unravaged nature. As has been stated

"each offers its unique contribution to man, each complements the other and through such variety man's whole existence will be enriched,"¹ and

(b) that the proposed Internal Structures of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region comply with the criteria set forth in the said "Guidelines for Regional Government", and serve as catalysts to not only preserve their history and traditions but also to promote a sense of separate identity and community consciousness for their inhabitants

¹ Lithwick, N.H., and Paquet, Urban Studies: A Canadian Perspective (Toronto: Methuen Publications, 1968); Woodbury, Coleman, ed., The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953); Robson, William A., Politics and Government at Home and abroad, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967); and Bollens, John C. and Schmandt, Henry J., The Metropolis, (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).

- (i) by equipping these Local Governments with realistic boundaries **and responsibilities** all their own, and
- (ii) by maintaining separate governmental institutions, elections and local administration there is the added element of diversity, and

(c) that we have proposed a Revitalized Two-Tier System of Local Government because it is our belief that to meet the demand, if any, for technical efficiency, the need is not to "SNUFF OUT THE FLAME OF LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT IN THE PROPOSED METROPOLITAN WENTWORTH REGION" and substitute a "ONE-TIER BUREAUCRACY" under the guise of meeting such demand but the need is for a "REVITALIZED TWO-TIER SYSTEM OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT" so that the citizens of this Region may not only benefit by improved efficiency in services, if any, but may continue to enjoy the rights and privileges of Local Self-Government which is their heritage as participants in a Democracy. We respectfully suggest, therefore, that if there are advantages to "One-Tier Government", it has been stated by an eminent authority "they are comparable with similar advantages in a completely centralized totalitarian form of National Government."

Therefore, the retention of a "Two-Tier System of Local Government" is not only desirable but is essential and necessary if we are to keep "Democracy at Home." We respectfully submit that the benefits of a federated - two-tier - or Metropolitan System of government have never been better described than they have been by Chairman Allen of The Metropolitan Corporation of Toronto when he stated:

" the opportunity for each and every citizen to be a part of his local municipality, not a name, street number and postal district in a mass of millions. Our municipal organization, a federation of the City and five boroughs, introduces a personality and flexibility, craved for by our metropolitan neighbours to the south."

(d) that our proposals for a Two-Tier System of Government for the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region coincide with the views expressed by William A. Robson in his publication "Local Government in Crisis" (at pp. 162 - 3):

"In conclusion, I must reaffirm my belief in the virtues of a sound and healthy system of local self-government. Few people today appear to understand the essential role of local government in the welfare state. I cannot comprehend how a society can call itself a welfare state unless it strives to ensure the widest possible participation by the citizens in the exercise of political power and the making of executive decisions. Local government is the **best** possible instrument to distribute power widely on democratic lines.

Today, unfortunately, there is a strong tendency in this country and elsewhere to concentrate power at the centre to an excessive degree and to neglect the potentialities of local government. As a consequence we are in some danger of becoming a managerial society, with the levers of power in the hands of an élite which manages private industry and trade through giant commercial companies, runs nationalized industries through public corporations, and public administration through a civil service working in the shadows of the Ministers whose powers they exercise.

Only by a three-pronged attack on organization, finance and central-local relations can we give local government its proper place in our polity. Only thus can we preserve and strengthen the qualities of local initiative, civic pride and public spirit from which the political virtues of the nation have sprung. Only thus can we develop and enhance the sense of community upon which a genuine democracy must rest."

thus, we respectfully suggest that our proposed Municipal Organization - a federation of two Cities and six Boroughs would introduce a personality and flexibility craved for not only by our "metropolitan neighbours to the South" but, and more importantly, by the citizens of the proposed Metropolitan Wentworth Region itself.

3 1761 11548501 3

